

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE
DEFERMENT OF PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE
PROVISIONS TO REGULATE PARANOMENCLATURE.
Z.N.(S.) 1973

By the Secretary, International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

The purpose of this paper is to give some further explanation of the reasons for deferring publication of the results of the votes on Voting Papers (80)18, points 3 and 4, and (80)39 (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 47-48).

In nearly all the groups in which dual taxonomies are used, they are expressed by dual nomenclatures (e.g. ammonites and aptychi; nautiloids and rhyncholites; holothurians and holothurian spicules, to mention but a few). In other words, Article 24b(i) of the present (1964) Code is ignored. The aim of the Editorial Committee's proposals (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 11-14) was to legalise this widespread and long-continued practice, in response to requests from workers in these fields.

Unfortunately, those proposals encountered determined opposition from workers in one group — the conodonts — who have adopted a different procedure. Whereas nearly all the work done on conodonts in the first 100 years since they were discovered was concerned with discrete elements, nowadays more attention is given to associations of elements known as apparatuses. The classification of elements as such cuts across the classification of apparatuses as such, so that a given genus of elements may be found in two, three or more genera of apparatuses. Nevertheless, conodont workers since 1966, and increasingly since 1972, have applied Article 24b(i) as though both elements and apparatuses could be dealt with in a single classification. It is now possible using statistical methods on large samples to associate together the elements that constituted a given apparatus, even if no specimen displaying that apparatus as a whole has been found. The oldest name among those of the constituent elements is then applied to that apparatus. At the species level, however, the specific name will only be applied to apparatuses that can be considered conspecific with the apparatus that contains the type specimen of the element with the oldest name. Closely similar elements that occur in apparatuses considered not to be conspecific with that species will be given different names. At the generic level, the oldest generic name applied to any of the elements will be applied to the apparatus unless the apparatus is considered not to be

congeneric with the one that represents the type species of the genus with the oldest name. In that case, some other generic name will be used.

A classic example of the way in which this method works in practice can be found in Bergström & Sweet, 1966, *Bull. amer. Paleont.* vol. 50, No. 229. This paper deals with the conodont fauna of a small part of the Ordovician System of the United States. Element species of a single element genus are distributed between two or even three apparatus genera. In some cases, a single binomen may mean both an element species (in a genus represented in two or three apparatus genera) and an apparatus species; in more numerous cases, a single generic name may be used to denote a number of element species (distributed in a number of apparatus genera) and an apparatus genus. It is impossible to tell by inspection which of two taxonomic meanings is intended by a particular citation of a name. A single nomenclature is made to serve the needs of two different, cross-cutting taxonomies in conodonts.

The task before the Commission is thus to find some way by which the procedure adopted by the conodont workers and that adopted for over 150 years by workers in other groups with parataxonomic problems can be covered by the Code. This will evidently be difficult and delicate, and may involve devising provisions that apply only to named groups of animals.